

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/808,949	AIGNER ET AL.	

**All Participants:**

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(1) A. Dexter Tugbang

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Mark Bilak (Reg. No. 47,423), for Applicant(s).

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 16 August 2007

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant  Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:  Yes  No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

**Rejection(s) discussed:**

*103(a) of Claim 1 in Final Rejection (mailed on July 27, 2005)*

**Claims discussed:**

1

**Prior art documents discussed:**

*Seipler et al and Berlincourt et al*

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
**A. DEXTER TUGBANG**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

After having carefully reviewed the prior art, the examiner urged the applicant(s) to further distinguish Claim 1 over the prior art, particularly the reference to Seipler. The examiner suggested language to further distinguish the relationship between step d and step c of Claim 1, most notably that step d occurs after step c. The proposed language that was agreed to by the applicant(s).

Furthermore, upon further consideration by the examiner, the examiner noted that the restriction requirement (paragraph 3, Final Rejection) will be withdrawn as Claim 1 is a generic claim. Thus, Claims 31-40 have been rejoined with generic Claim 1 and fully examined for patentability. Claims 3-9 have been canceled as they were substantially duplicates of Claims 31-40.

The restriction requirement (mailed on August 27, 2004), however, is maintained. The examiner urged that Claims 10-30 be canceled as they are directed to another invention, non-elected.

The applicant(s) have agreed to all of the changes above (as noted in the attached Examiner's Amendment), which places the application in condition for allowance...